

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions to obviate the clerical mistakes. Claim 18 has been amended to recite a Markush group of benefit agents as supported by the specification at page 10, lines 33-35 and page 11, lines 19-24.

Claims 18-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoseyov et al. (US 5,719,044, 2-17-1998), Schulein et al. (WO 94/07998, 4-14-1994) and Linder et al. (PNAS, 1996, Vol. 93:12251-55) and the allegedly common knowledge in the art regarding making antibodies through camelization procedure (see Hamers et al., WO 94/25591).

The primary reference cited by the Examiner, i.e. Shoseyov, teaches cellulose binding domain and a fusion protein which may comprise cellulose binding domain and a second protein (protein A or HSP protein). See column 4, lines 45-58. Shoseyov further teaches diagnostics kits or immunoassay methods wherein the second protein binds to a detectable label or an enzyme. See column 5, line 58 - column 7, line 67. Shoseyov further teaches binding of cellulose binding domain with a drug, e.g. an anti fungal agent. The binding may be done directly or via a linker such as an activation agent via amine or ester bonds. See column 8, lines 1 - 35.

The amended claims distinguish more clearly over the cited art. Specifically none of the cited art suggests:

1. any chemical equilibrium constant, or
2. equilibrium constant lower than  $10^{-4}M$ , or

3. binding of the high binding antibody or fragment to a benefit agent defined by the Markush group in applicants' claims, a fabric, a specific part of the fabric, microparticles loaded with a benefit agent.

None of the cited references teach or suggest an entity comprised of:

1. cellulose binding domain;
2. antibody or antibody fragment;
3. the antibody or antibody fragment binding to a benefit agent defined by the Markush group in applicants' claims, a fabric a specific part of the fabric, or microparticles which are loaded with a benefit agent.

Thus, none of the cited references, either when taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the present invention or provide any motivation to arrive at the present invention. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the obviousness rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's consideration of an Information Disclosure Statement of documents submitted with Information Disclosure Statement dated November 29, 2001 (copy of Form 1449 is enclosed for the Examiner's convenience).

Claim 25 was rejected under the judiciary created Doctrine of Obviousness-type Double-patenting. In light of the availability of the Terminal Disclaimer practice, applicants agree to the filing of the Terminal Disclaimer upon the indication of the allowable subject matter.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the application be allowed to issue.

If a telephone conversation would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of the present application, applicants' undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Rimma Mitelman", written over a horizontal line.

Rimma Mitelman  
Registration No. 34,396  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

RM/sa  
(201) 840-2671